

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please replace FIGS. 1 and 2 with the accompanying replacement sheets for FIGS. 1 and 2 to the application. The figures as amended show all of the claimed features and employ proper line quality. The amendments add no new subject matter to the application.

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3, 5, 7-12, 14, and 16-18 that are pending in the above-identified patent application. Applicant has cancelled claims 4, 6, 13, and 15 herein. Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, and 18 to recite the allowable subject matter. Applicant has amended the specification, and the drawings. No new matter has been added by the amendments herein. In view of the following discussion, Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter:

Applicant respectfully acknowledges that the Examiner has stated that claims 9 and 18 have allowable subject matter. As aforementioned, Applicant has amended independent claims 9 and 18 for consistency, and respectfully submits that amended independent claims 9 and 18 are, therefore, patentable.

Drawing Objections:

At pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a). Specifically, the Examiner alleged that the second summing circuit must be shown and the second error signal needs to be clearly identified. The Examiner further alleged that the drawings lacked proper line quality. Applicant respectfully submits that element U2 is the second summing circuit as shown in amended FIG. 2, and Applicant has labeled the second summing circuit as 130 accordingly. Applicant respectfully submits that error signals 124, 128 are clearly identified in amended FIGS. 1 and 2, and that amended FIGS. 1 and 2 include proper line quality. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the replacement sheets of amended FIGS. 1 and 2 comply with 37 C.F.R. §§1.83(a) and 1.121(d), and respectfully requests that the Examiner's drawing objections be withdrawn.

Claim Objections:

At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to claims 9 and 18 due to informalities. Specifically, the Examiner alleged that claims 9 and 18 recite "a second error voltage" and suggested that the subject claims instead recite "a second error signal". Applicant has amended claims 9 and 18 as suggested by the Examiner, and Applicant has amended claim 16 to remove the same informality. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that informalities no longer exist, and

respectfully requests that the Examiner's claim objections be withdrawn.

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has stated that claims 4-8 and 13-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10 to include the subject matter of claims 4, 6, 13, and 15, respectively, as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant has cancelled claims 4, 6, 13, and 15 accordingly, and amended claims 5 and 7 to correctly depend from amended independent claim 1. As amended independent claims 1 and 10 contain allowable subject matter, Applicant submits that amended independent claims 1 and 10 are, therefore, patentable. As claims 5, 7, 8, 14, and 16-17 depend from amended independent claims 1 and 10, respectively, Applicant submits that claims 5, 7, 8, 14, and 16-17 are likewise patentable and are no longer dependent upon a rejected base claim. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's claim objections be withdrawn.

Specification Objection:

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the specification for informalities. Specifically, the Examiner alleged that paragraph [0033] inconsistently recites "an error voltage on line 128" and then later recites "the error signal on line 128". Applicant has amended paragraph [0033] to recite "an error signal on line 128", and respectfully submits that paragraph [0033] is now consistent. Applicant amended paragraphs [0019], [0021], [0034], and [0037] for consistency regarding the recitation of an error signal. Applicant further amended paragraphs [0019] and [0021] to recite "the input level" instead of "the input a level" for grammatical correctness. Applicant submits that the specification is consistent and no longer contains informalities. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's specification objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection under §102(b):

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dugan (U.S. Pat. No. 4,864,627). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection.

As aforementioned, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 10 to include the allowable subject matter of claims 4, 6, 13, and 15, respectively, as suggested by the Examiner. As

amended independent claims 1 and 10 contain allowable subject matter, Applicant submits that amended independent claims 1 and 10 are, therefore, patentable. As claims 2-3 and 11-12 depend from amended independent claims 1 and 10, respectively, Applicant submits that claims 2-3 and 11-12 are, therefore, likewise patentable. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's §102(b) rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion:

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the instant claims are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited. The fee for the petition is included herewith. In the event there are any fees due and owing in connection with this matter, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 11-0223.

Dated: July 3, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: s/Matthew B. Dernier/

Matthew B. Dernier

Registration No.: 40,989

KAPLAN GILMAN GIBSON & DERNIER LLP

900 Route 9 North, Suite 104

Woodbridge, New Jersey 07095

(732) 634-7634

Attorneys for Applicant